



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The book is well written in a clear and easy style and despite the mass of details holds the interest of the reader. As a compendium of information on the political, social, and religious movements reflected in the works of Horace, annotated by exact references to that poet and his contemporaries and the modern literature on these subjects, the student of Horace will find it invaluable. From this point of view the author is justified in his anticipatory defense of the treatment *gemino ab ovo* of the Parthians and Ager Publicus, to which the reader may be tempted to add the Spaniards, magic, and astrology. In general, Professor D'Alton's sound judgment has saved him from the common pitfall of higher criticism, the preconceived theory about which he warns the reader in his Preface. The reviewer, however, suspects that a tendency to overstress the dominance of Augustus and the religious revival in Horace's thought has led this conservative scholar to read an uncourtier-like reference to Antony's slanders against the maternal ancestry of Augustus into a general remark of Horace (*Satires* 1. 6. 34) and to insist on the sincerity of Horace's recantation of Epicurean skepticism in *Ode* 1. 34. Professor D'Alton in the historical study of astrology follows Cumont and other modern scholars in ascribing anticipations of astrology to the Pythagorean Plato and Aristotle and in the hypothesis of a fusion of Stoicism and astrology. In a review of Pfeiffer's *Studien zum antiken Sternglauben* (*Classical Philology* [July, 1917] pp. 316 ff.) the present reviewer endeavored to show that the evidence for the acceptance of astrology by the Stoics is neither convincing nor positive and that the cosmic theories of Plato and Aristotle precluded a belief in astrology. The reference cited by the author (*Cic. de nat. deorum* ii. 15. 39) proves only that the Stoics believed that the stars shared in the divinity of the universe.

It may seem hypercritical to call attention to two instances of *lapsus linguae* in a book otherwise so free from errors in style—the use of “enthuse” (p. 120) and the meaning of “apprize” (p. 129).

GENEVA MISENER

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Procopius' Works. With an English translation by H. B. DEWING. In six volumes. Vols. I and II (Loeb Classical Library). New York: Putnam, 1914, 1916. Pp. xv+583, 488.

Not the least of the pleasant surprises offered by the editors of the Loeb Library is their plentiful inclusion of the works of the later and less-known Greek authors. Procopius deserves attention because he is the historian of an important period, and because he has on the whole told his story reliably and interestingly. He has consciously tried to model his style on Herodotus and Thucydides. His very failure is exceedingly instructive to the student

of the earlier models. He fails utterly to achieve Thucydides' philosophical view of historical events. He does a little better with Herodotus' rambling story-telling. The tale of the pearl and the oyster is almost as good as Herodotus himself could have produced. The character sketch of Alaman-douras is one not easily to be forgotten. Procopius is keen enough to recognize the tireless energy of these Persian and Vandal chiefs. *Δραστήριος* is his favorite epithet for them. Some of his contrasting pictures of the idle luxury of the Byzantines and this fresh, unexhausted vigor with which they must cope almost lead one to believe that Procopius had already read the fate of the empire.

The introduction is brief and presents an accurate sketch of the life and writings of Procopius. The text is that of Haury. It is a great pity that there are no maps.

Mr. Dewing's translation is not inspired. It reads best when the Greek is most difficult, as in the speeches. Continuous narrative often seems to induce slipshod expressions. "The case is the same" (I, 221), is awkward English and corresponds to nothing in the Greek. "At all" and "indeed" are too-frequent translations of the particles. "Certain" is rarely correct for *τις*, and yet it is found often, sometimes twice on a single page. The Greek participle is much too frequently translated by the English participle, especially in an absolute construction at the end of sentences and in prepositional phrases as a gerund. "Tried to lay claim to the office" (I, 201) is a strange expression. "Rascals" (I, 189) is a superfluous addition which serves only to give form to a difficult sentence. "As Pacuvius observed" (I, 41) is rather, "Under the eyes of Pacuvius." In I, 33, the sense is obscured by omitting *περιῶν* in the translation and leaving an oddly ambiguous "he." *Ἐν τρικυμiais φερομένης* (II, 21) is not "tossed amid the billows of uncertain fortune," but "the last extremity of fortune." Procopius' idiomatic use of *ὥς* with the superlative is frequently overtranslated, for example, *ὥς ἀσφαλέστατα* (II, 39) is not "as securely as possible," but "very securely." The author sometimes prints one text and translates another. For example, in II, 107, *ῥηκνύμενην* is translated "situated," evidently for the variant reading *κειμένην*. In II, 7, note 2 is wrong and can be justified only by adopting the impossible reading *περίοδος*, a reading rightly discarded in both text and translation.

These are only examples of a hurried carelessness which further revision might easily have corrected and which is far too characteristic of the whole version. The author's rendering is sometimes little superior to schoolboys' translation English. For example, "When Justinian considered that the situation was as favorable as possible, both as to domestic affairs and as to his relations with Persia" (II, 91). "This, then, is pretty well how matters stand among the people of each and every city" (I, 221). In general, however, the translation is accurate and adheres closely to the structure and order of the original.

It is worth noting that this is the first English rendering that deserves the name of a translation. That of Holcroft (London, 1653) is only a paraphrase condensing the narrative by almost half, as is quaintly stated in the Preface, "Although I shall not charge Procopius himself with the imputation of Tautologies and too prodigal Periphrases, yet I can safely ascertain the Reader, he shall find this discourse far more contract and close than the Author himself, and so his expectation shall not linger so long e'er it be satisfied with the events."

JOHN W. BEARDSLEE, JR.

NEW BRUNSWICK
NEW JERSEY

Gai Suetoni Tranquilli de vita Caesarum. Libri i-ii, Julius and Augustus. By JOHN HOWELL WESTCOTT and EDWIN MOORE RANKIN. Allyn & Bacon, 1918. Pp. liv+373.

The biographical data for Suetonius are briefly given, and of the *Lives* it is said: "They are interesting because they are packed full of vivid details concerning real men" (p. xx). Yet a high rank is not assigned to Suetonius: "He never betrays insight into the springs of character, never traces the development of fundamental traits, never comprehends the significance of the ruler's character and aims as an influence on the world he governs. He is not an artist but an antiquarian" (p. xix). While he may have a "morbidity relish for scandal" (p. 114, 5), it must be borne in mind that he was portraying very fleshly men. His method is that of Plutarch also, and not the least interesting of the facts given in the *Julius and Augustus* are some which find a parallel in the life of Alexander. Both writers held the mirror up to nature, and both reveal some strange scenes.

The editors have no fears of repetition, as the date of the Battle of Munda is given at least eight times, three times on pages 204 and 205. Similar to this is the date for the consul Marcellus, found three times on pages 138 and 139. Such repetitions could be obviated by a biographical-historical section in which could be collected the material scattered through the notes. It would be equally as useful as the "Diction and Style" (pp. xxvi-l). This gives in about one hundred and fifty divisions the main stylistic facts, with one or more examples of each. Constant reference is made to these in the notes, yet in more than two score the student will find only the example before him in the text. At other times the note is fuller than the section to which he is referred. As illustrations, see the notes on *item* (p. 151, 20) and *sed et* (p. 199, 26). Here and there the cross-references are to notes which are practically equivalent, as on pages 188, 5 and 202, 15, where, with slight verbal changes, one note could be substituted for the other. There is also an occasional run-on note, as on page 169, 4, where reference is made to page 13, line 24, and there to page 10, line 20.